arXiv:quant-ph/9810057v1 19 Oct 1998

About optimal measurements in quantum hypothesizes testing.

A.E. Allahverdyan, D.B. Saakian

Yerevan Physics Institute

Alikhanian Brothers St.2, Yerevan 375036, Armenia

We consider the problem of a state determination for a two-level quantum system which can be in one of two nonorthogonal mixed states. It is proved that for the two independent identical systems the optimal combined measurement (which considers the pair as one system) cannot be less optimal than the corresponding sequential one (local measurements, accompanying by transfer of classical information). The case of equality is achieved only when the mixed states have the same eigenvalues or the same eigenvectors. Further, we consider a case then the two systems are entangled: measurement of one system induces a reduction of the another one's state. The conclusion about optimal character of combined measurement takes place again, and conditions where the above-mentioned methods coincide are derived.

PACS: 03.65.Bz, 03.67.-a, 03.67.Hk, 89.70.+c

A determination of an unknown quantum state is one of the most important problems in modern quantum theory [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]. It is usually assumed that there are unlimited number of identical and independent systems in the same state (replicas). Then an estimation of the unknown state with arbitrary precision is possible. However, the well-known theorem [6] forbids cloning of any unknown state; thus for generation of sufficiently large number of replicas the exact control of the corresponding equipment should be achieved. In any case it is reasonable to consider a finite number of different replicas, i.e., some error in determination of the quantum state is unavoidable. On the other hand, different replicas can be correlated. Particularly, this fact can be viewed against exhaustive interpretation of probabilities (quantum or classical) in spirit of the law of large numbers [7].

The particular case of an unknown state determination is quantum hypothesizes testing: It is assumed that the system can be only in one of some non-orthogonal states. The similar situation occurs also in quantum information theory where classical information is transmitted by means of some non-orthogonal states [5] [9] [10]. Generally speaking, nonorthogonality can arise due to noises in the transmitter or energy loss in the channel. Also it can be connected with the construction of the transmitter, which generates coherent states for example. It is not necessary to consider non-orthogonality as some hindrance only: In some cases (such as quantum cryptography or some noisy channels) non-orthogonal states can be more useful. We shall consider the case of *bayesian* hypothesizes testing where some *a priori* probabilities are assumed for the each hypothesis. Particularly, information from preceding experiments can be accumulated at these probabilities. Let a two-level quantum system (qubit) A can be in two different non-orthogonal mixed states: ρ_1 and ρ_2 with equal a priori probabilities. A measurement is taken, which is described by operators Π_1 and Π_2 ($\Pi_1 + \Pi_2$=1), for distinguishing between them. The probability of registration a state ρ_k if the initial state was ρ_i is $p(k/i) = \mathrm{tr}(\rho_i \Pi_k)$. The optimal measurement must minimize the mean probability of error P_e,

$$P_e = \frac{1}{2}(p(2/1) + p(1/2)) = \frac{1}{2}(1 + \mathrm{tr}(\rho\Pi_2)),$$
$$\rho = \rho_1 - \rho_2 \qquad (1)$$

We see that $\mathrm{tr}(\rho\Pi_2) = \sum_i (\rho\Pi_2)_{(i)}$ should be minimized (where $(\rho\Pi_2)_{(i)}$ is the corresponding eigenvalue). Thus the resulting formulas are [5]

$$\Pi_2^{(\mathrm{opt})} = \sum_i \theta(-\rho_{(i)})|\rho_{(i)}\rangle\langle\rho_{(i)}|,$$
$$P_e^{(\mathrm{opt})}(\rho_1,\rho_2) = \frac{1}{2}(1+\sum_i \theta(-\rho_{(i)})\rho_{(i)}). \quad (2)$$

The optimal measurement allows to rederive a priori probabilities. If $\bar{p}_s(k)$ is the probability of the initial realization of ρ_k if ρ_s was recorded, then according to the famous Bayes-Laplace formula we have

$$\bar{p}_s(k) = \frac{1}{2}\frac{p(s/k)}{p(s)}, \quad (3)$$

where $p(s) = (p(s/1) + p(s/2))/2$ are the total output probabilities. Thus, if the result of the measurement is s as *post priori* probabilities can be chosen $\bar{p}_s(1)$ and $\bar{p}_s(2)$.

Now let us assume that there is exactly the same system B which is independent from the previous one. If the method of measurement allows to consider the systems A, B as one single system (combined or global measurements) we have the case of distinguishing between $\rho_1\otimes\rho_1$ and $\rho_2\otimes\rho_2$; so the corresponding minimal mean error is

$$P_{e,g} = P_e^{(\mathrm{opt})}(\rho_1\otimes\rho_1, \rho_2\otimes\rho_2). \quad (4)$$

However, in practice combined measurements cannot be realized in many cases (for example, if A and B is separated by a sufficiently large distance). In such cases an other scheme can be proposed: Sequential (or local, accompanying by transfer of classical information) measurements. There are two different observers for each replica, and the following steps are realized: To measure the system A, to obtain the corresponding post priori probabilities, after this to send this (classical) information to a B-observer, which can use them as the a priori probabilities for his measurement. The mean error in this scheme must depend on an outcome of the first measurement, thus the total mean error probability can be defined by averaging with the output probabilities $p(s)$ of the first measurement. The resulting formula is

$$P_{e,l} = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{s=1}^{2} p(s/1)\sum_k \theta(-\rho_{(k)}(s))\rho_{(k)}(s),$$
$$\rho(s) = \rho_1 - \lambda(s)\rho_2,\ \lambda(s) = \frac{p(s/2)}{p(s/1)}. \quad (5)$$

First, the physical difference between combined and sequential measurements has been pointed out by Peres and Wootters [1]. Here the case of three linearly-dependent pure-state hypothesizes was investigated, and showed, by numerical methods, that combined measurements are more optimal. For a more practically important case of two linearly-independent pure-states hypothesizes it was shown [3] [4] that these methods coincide (in the sense of the mean probability of error [3], as well as in the sense of mutual information [4]). For the same case, but using a quantity which is neither the mutual information nor the mean probability of error, the problem has been considered in Ref. [2]. It was claimed again that combined measurements are more optimal. The optimal character of combined measurements has been stressed very recently also [12]. In the present paper we consider mixed states and mean probability of error as the measure of distinguishability; the problem in more general settings remains open.

For calculating $P_{e,l}$, $P_{e,g}$ it is convenient to choose the base where the matrix $\rho = \rho_1 - \rho_2$ is the diagonal one. Thus we have ($k = 1, 2$, $\langle 0|\bar{0}\rangle = \delta_{\bar{0}0}$):

$$\rho_k = x_k|0\rangle\langle 0| + (1-x_k)|\bar{0}\rangle\langle\bar{0}| + z|0\rangle\langle\bar{0}| + z^*|\bar{0}\rangle\langle 0|. \quad (6)$$

After calculations (which are not reproduced here) we get

$$P_{e,g} = \frac{1}{2}(1 - |x_1 - x_2|(|x_1+x_2-1| + \sqrt{1+4|z|^2})), \quad (7)$$

$$P_{e,l} = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{|x_1-x_2|}{4}$$
$$(\sqrt{1+4[|z|^2 + |x_1+x_2-1|^2 + |x_1+x_2-1|]}$$
$$+\sqrt{1+4[|z|^2 + |x_1+x_2-1|^2 - |x_1+x_2-1|]_+}), \quad (8)$$

where $[x]_+ = (x+|x|)/2$. In the general case it can be proved exactly that $P_{e,g} \le P_{e,l}$, i.e., the combined

measurement is more optimal. The equality is achieved in the following cases: 1) $\rho_1 = \rho_2$ (it is the trivial and non-interesting case where the state is known exactly); 2) $x_1 + x_2 = 1$, when the matrices ρ_1, ρ_2 have the same eigenvalues; 3) $z = 0$, when ρ_1 and ρ_2 commute (i.e., the corresponding eigenvalues can be obtained simultaneously). All these cases can be jointed saying that $P_{e,g} = P_{e,l}$ holds if the matrices have the same eigenvalues or the same eigenvectors. It seems to us that these results are more general ones but we have not succeeded in proving it. Particularly, the statement holds for two pure-state hypothesizes [3] [4].

We have considered the case of two uncorrelated replicas of the same system. Now let us consider the case where replicas A, B are entangled. As it was stated above, this fact can be connected with the corresponding equipment which prepares replicas. The similar statement of problem occurs also in the broadcast quantum-classical communication [10], and more generally in cases when a many-particle quantum system is measured.

Let us assume that the pairs of replicas can be in the following pure states:

$$|\psi_k\rangle = \alpha_k|0\rangle_A|0\rangle_B + \gamma_k|\bar{0}\rangle_A|\bar{0}\rangle_B + \beta_k|0\rangle_A|\bar{0}\rangle_B + \tilde{\beta_k}|\bar{0}\rangle_A|0\rangle_B,\ k = 1, 2. \quad (9)$$

The following restriction is added

$$\mathrm{tr}_{A(B)}|\psi_k\rangle\langle\psi_k| = \rho_k, \quad (10)$$

in other words the replicas are equivalent although they are entangled (i.e., cannot be moved to a product-state using local transformations *only*). For this condition it is sufficient to choose $\tilde{\beta_k} = \beta_k$. The base $|0\rangle$, $|\bar{0}\rangle$ is again the eigenbase of the matrix $\rho = \rho_1 - \rho_2$: It holds

$$\alpha_1\beta_1^* + \beta_1\gamma_1^* = \alpha_2\beta_2^* + \beta_2\gamma_2^*. \quad (11)$$

It should be noted that we choose the *local* base, therefore the entanglement conserves.

The method of combined measurement is unchanged: the states $|\psi_1\rangle$, $|\psi_2\rangle$ must be distinguished with equal a priori probabilities; thus the corresponding mean probability of error is

$$P_{e,g} = \frac{1}{2}(1 - \sqrt{1 - |\tau|^2}),\ \tau = \langle\psi_2|\psi_1\rangle \quad (12)$$

It is obvious, that after a measurement of A a reduction of the general system's state occurs. We shall describe this reduction as the standard von Neumann's one. However, it is extremely important to recognize that the reduction of this type is not realized for *arbitrary* quantum measurement. Furthermore, for its realization a special control to system-apparatus interaction must be ensured (for recent discussion see [8]).

After the optimal measurement of A the total wavefunction is changed as

$$|\psi_k\rangle \to |\psi_k^{(s)}\rangle = \frac{\Pi_s^{(\mathrm{opt})}|\psi_k\rangle}{\sqrt{\langle\psi_k|\Pi_s^{(\mathrm{opt})}|\psi_k\rangle}},\ k, s = 1, 2, \quad (13)$$

(where $\Pi_s^{(\mathrm{opt})}$ acts only on A-coordinates). Thus the B-observer "sees" the states

$$\rho_k^{(s)} = \mathrm{tr}_A(|\psi_k^{(s)}\rangle\langle\psi_k^{(s)}|). \quad (14)$$

In the first place, the optimal measurement is performed on the system A. Thus, a priori probabilities can be rederived to post priori ones and sent to B-observer, who should determine the actual state of his sub-system. (The similar separation of information to quantum one, realizing through the reduction, and classical one takes place, for example, in quantum teleportation [11].) As it is usual, at the final stage the result should be averaged by $p(s)$. Thus it holds

$$P_{e,l} = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{s=1}^{2} p(s/1)\sum_k \theta(-\rho_{(k)}^{(s)}(s))\rho_{(k)}^{(s)}(s),$$
$$\rho^{(s)}(s) = \rho_1^{(s)} - \lambda(s)\rho_2^{(s)},\ \lambda(s) = \frac{p(s/2)}{p(s/1)}. \quad (15)$$

With (9) we get

$$P_{e,l} = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{4}(\sqrt{(x_1 - x_2)^2 + 4|\alpha_1\beta_2 - \alpha_2\beta_1|^2} + \sqrt{(x_1 - x_2)^2 + 4|\gamma_1\beta_2 - \gamma_2\beta_1|^2}),$$
$$x_1 = |\alpha_1|^2 + |\beta_1|^2,\ x_2 = |\alpha_2|^2 + |\beta_2|^2. \quad (16)$$

Our central problems are to compare $P_{e,l}$ and $P_{e,g}$, and to derive the conditions when these quantities coincide.

$$(1-2P_{e,l})^2-(1-2P_{e,g})^2$$
$$=u_1(u_2-1-\bar{\tau})+u_2(u_1-1+\bar{\tau})+|\tau|^2-\bar{\tau}^2$$
$$+2\sqrt{u_1u_2(1-\bar{\tau}-u_1)(1+\bar{\tau}-u_2)}, \qquad (17)$$

where we have introduced the following notations:

$$2u_{1,2}=x_1+x_2\mp 2|\alpha_1\alpha_2^*+\beta_1\beta_2^*|,$$
$$\bar{\tau}=|\alpha_1\alpha_2^*+\beta_1\beta_2^*|+|\gamma_1\gamma_2^*+\beta_1\beta_2^*|. \qquad (18)$$

If $\bar{\tau}=|\tau|$ when the right-hand side of Eq. (17) is always non-positive, it becomes exactly negative if $\bar{\tau}\neq|\tau|$ because now $\bar{\tau}>|\tau|$. Thus the combined method stills more optimal one, and the methods are equitable if

$$\bar{\tau}=|\tau|,\ u_1(1+|\tau|)=u_2(1-|\tau|). \qquad (19)$$

These conditions are satisfied automatically if $|\psi_1\rangle$, $|\psi_2\rangle$ can be presented as direct products. Conditions (19) can be written in a more subtle way:

$$\arg(\langle\psi_2|\Pi_1^{(\mathrm{opt})}|\psi_1\rangle)=\arg(\langle\psi_2|\Pi_2^{(\mathrm{opt})}|\psi_1\rangle), \qquad (20)$$

$$2|\langle\psi_2|\Pi_s^{(\mathrm{opt})}|\psi_1\rangle|=|\langle\psi_2|\psi_1\rangle|(\langle\psi_1|\Pi_s^{(\mathrm{opt})}|\psi_1\rangle$$
$$+\langle\psi_2|\Pi_s^{(\mathrm{opt})}|\psi_2\rangle) \qquad (21)$$

(the conditions with $s=1,2$ are equivalent). We see that an entanglement between replicas can make the combined method more optimal than the sequential one. The detailed investigation of Eqs. (20)(21) will be given elsewhere. Let us mention only some special cases (among many others) where the conditions (20)(21) are satisfied (it is assumed for simplicity that all parameters are real, and $|\psi_k\rangle$ are correctly normalized): 1) $\alpha_1=\gamma_2$, $\alpha_2=\gamma_1$, $\beta_1=\beta_2$; 2) $\alpha_1=-\gamma_1$, $\alpha_2=-\gamma_2$; 3) $\alpha_1=\gamma_1$, $\alpha_2=\gamma_2$, $\alpha_1\beta_1=\alpha_2\beta_2$.

We have proved that for a binary-state unknown system the combined measurement is more optimal than the sequential one, excepting two special cases where the corresponding mixed states have the same eigenvectors or the same eigenvalues. Also we prove that this conclusion about the combined method takes place again if the replicas of the unknown system are entangled (excepting the special cases described by Eqs. (20)(21)).

This work was inspirited by the brilliant paper of E.T. Jaynes [7], where a very elegant and interesting discussion about quantum statistical description can be found.

[1] A.Peres and W.K.Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett., **66**, 1119, (1991).

[2] S. Massar and S. Popescu, Phys. Rev. Lett., **74**, 1259, (1995).

[3] B. Brody and B. Meister, Phys. Rev. Lett., **76**, 1, (1996).

[4] M. Ban, K. Yamazaki, and O.Hirota, Phys. Rev. A, **55**, 22, (1997).

[5] C.W. Helstrom, *Quantum detection and estimation theory.* Academic Press, 1976.

[6] W.K. Wootters and W.H. Zurek, Nature, **299**, 802, (1982); H.Barnum et al., Phys.Rev.Lett., **76**, 2818, (1996).

[7] E.T. Jaynes, Phys. Rev., **108**, 171, (1957).

[8] M. Ozawa, e-print quant-ph/9805033.

[9] C.M. Caves, and P.D. Drummond, Rev. Mod. Phys., **66**,481,(1994).

[10] A.E. Allahverdyan and D.B. Saakian, submitted to Phys.Rev. A, e-print quant-ph/9805067.

[11] C. Bennett et al. Phys. Rev. Lett., **70**, 1895, (1993).

[12] C. Bennett et al., e-print quant-ph/9804053.